



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,799	03/04/2002	Lester Sussman		1626

7590 08/05/2005
LESTER SUSSMAN
9213 BULLS RUN PARKWAY
BETHESDA, MD 20817

EXAMINER

SCHUBERT, KEVIN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,799

Applicant(s)

SUSSMAN, LESTER

Examiner

Kevin Schubert

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 have been considered.

Claim Objections

- 5 Claims 3 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "applied to copy of directory information" is missing an appropriate article. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

- 10 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 15 Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Step c is indefinite. It is unclear whether the confidential information in said electronic mail message is used in the process to "determine a time" or to simply "retrieve said log file". Appropriate correction is required.

- 20 Claims 6 and 12 recites the limitation "said secure accessing". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 25 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- 30 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2137

Claims 1-2,4-5,7-8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrath, U.S. Patent No. 2002/0069097, in view of Schneier (Schneier, Bruce. Applied Cryptography. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1996. New York. Pages 28-41).

5 As per claims 1-2,4-5,7-8, and 10-11, the applicant discloses a method of synchronizing directory information stored on a central computer system and a copy of said directory information stored on a second remote electronic system, the method comprising the following limitations which are met by Conrath in view of Schneier:

- a) determining whether any changes have occurred with the said directory information stored on
10 the said central computer system and storing changes in a log file (Conrath: [0091]-[0092]);
- b) determining which second remote electronic system requires said (Conrath: [0091]-[0092]);
- c) connecting said central computer system to said second remote electronic system (Conrath:
[0091]-[0092]);
- d) sending an electronic mail message from said client computer system to said remote electronic
15 system, on said data communications link, with notification of the presence of said log file (Conrath:
[0091]-[0092]);
- e) sending confidential information in said electronic mail message detailing how to retrieve said
log file (Conrath: [0091]-[0092]; Schneier: pages 28-29);

Conrath discloses all the limitations of parts a through d. Conrath also discloses that a user may
20 be notified of a directory update through an e-mail message which instructs him how to retrieve the log file. Conrath is silent as to how the information is sent.

Schneier discloses the idea of symmetric key cryptography. Combining the ideas of Schneier with those of Conrath allows the system to send confidential information. All of the organization's hand held users could be given the symmetric key so that the two parties would be able to transmit confidential
25 information between themselves. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine the ideas of Schneier with those of Conrath because doing so

Art Unit: 2137

increases security in the system by only allowing the information to be viewed and used by an authorized party.

As per claims 2,4-5,8, and 10-11, the applicant discloses the method of claims 1 and 7, which are met by Conrath in view of Schneier, with the following limitation which is met by Conrath and Schneier:

a) receiving said electronic mail notification and verifying that said electronic mail was sent by said central computer system (Schneier: pages 28-41);

b) receiving said electronic mail notification and verifying that said electronic mail was not modified after being sent by said central computer system (Schneier: pages 28-41);

c) determining a time to retrieve said log file from said central computer system (Conrath: [0091]).

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig, U.S. Patent No. 6,266,809, in further view of Salgado, U.S. Patent No. 2002/0067504.

As per claims 3 and 9, the applicant describes the method of claims 2 and 8, which are met by Conrath in view of Schneier, with the following limitations which are met by Conrath, Craig, and Salgado:

a) accessing securely the said central computer system on said communication link, using said confidential information in said electronic mail notification (Conrath: [0091]-[0092]; Schneier: pages 28-

29);

b) retrieving said log file by means of said communications data link storing said log file on remote electronic system (Conrath: [0091]-[0092]);

c) disconnecting from said central computer system on said data communications link (Conrath: [0092]-[0092]);

d) updating said directory information on said remote electronic system using said retrieved log file (Conrath: [0091]-[0092]);

Art Unit: 2137

e) notifying said central computer system that said remote electronic system updated its directory information using said log file and notifying said central computer system of any errors encountered during the update (Craig: Col 6, lines 52-67);

f) notifying the user of said remote electronic system that changes have been applied to copy of
5 directory information stored on said electronic system (Salgado: [0027]);

Conrath in view of Schneier discloses all the limitations of claims 2 and 8 and the limitations of parts a through d. However, Conrath in view of Schneier do not disclose limitations e and f. More specifically with regard to part e, Conrath in view of Schneier do not disclose notifying the central computer system that a successful update occurred or notifying the central computer that an
10 unsuccessful update occurred. This idea is disclosed by Craig. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine the ideas of Craig with those of Conrath in view of Schneier and notify the central computer system whether the update was successful or unsuccessful because doing so gives the central computer system the opportunity to execute the update process a second time in the event that a failure occurred during the first update.

15 Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig disclose all the limitations of parts a through e. However, Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig do not disclose notifying the user after an update has completed. Salgado discloses this idea. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine the ideas of Salgado with those of Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig because notifying the user that an update occurred assures the
20 user that the data he needs has been successfully transferred.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig in further view of Salgado in further view of the applicant's admitted prior art.

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 6 and 12, the applicant describes the method of claims 3 and 9, which are met by Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig in further view of Salgado, with the following limitation which is met by the applicant's admitted prior art:

Wherein said secure accessing of said central computer system by said remote electronic system
5 is by means of the Secure Sockets Layer technology (AAPA: pages 7-8);

Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig in further view of Salgado disclose all the limitations of claims 3 and 9. However, Conrath in view of Schneier do not disclose the user of SSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine the ideas of Salgado with those of Conrath in view of Schneier in further view of Craig in further view of
10 Salgado because SSL is commonly accepted as a well-known and effective method for securely communicating data.

Conclusion

This action is made non-final.

15 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Schubert whose telephone number is (571) 272-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where
20 this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should
25 you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER